

M

D

C

SPEECH

—OF—

M. K. COWAN, ESQ.

M. P. SOUTH ESSEX,

WINDSOR, ONT.

Delivered in the House of Commons,

Ottawa, May 1st, 1900,

—ON—

CANADA'S TOBACCO
INDUSTRY.

1900

CANADA'S TOBACCO INDUSTRY.

Mr. M. K. COWAN (Essex). At this hour, Mr. Speaker, and at this stage of the debate, it is not my intention for one moment to follow the various arguments which have been advanced by the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), who has just spoken. But there are one or two statements he made, to which I propose devoting some small attention before branching into the two points on which I purpose dwelling before I resume my seat. The hon. member for Bothwell labored for one solid hour to show—and apparently he argued it satisfactorily to his own mind—that farm produce in Canada to-day was cheaper than it was prior to 1896. He then went on to show that the articles which the farmer had to buy were dearer to-day than they were prior to 1896, and then he made the startling admission that the farmer was prosperous to day, and that the whole country was prosperous.

* * * * *

There is another matter to which I intend to refer at some little length. I was extremely sorry and extremely surprised to hear come from the lips of the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) certain erroneous statements about the tobacco duties. I tell the hon. gentleman, that if he circulates that speech of his throughout the county of Bothwell, and if they take no more stock in the whole speech than they will in his statement about tobacco, then the speech will find a repository in the back yard before they get beyond that one single assertion. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) said that this government had put over \$1,000,000 duty on the poor man's tobacco, and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) now nods his head in assent. I had hoped that by this time he would have recanted, and would have been sorry for making a statement which is so absolutely far from the facts. No one knows better than the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy), because he grows tobacco himself, that you can go into the market of the town of Wallaceburg, or the village of Dresden, where he lives, and you can buy for 66 $\frac{2}{3}$ cents to-day the same amount of tobacco that you would have to pay \$1 for before 1897. No one knows better than the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), that Havana cigars and fancy Virginia smoking tobacco have increased in price—that is, cigars costing from eight to twelve cents, or that you buy over the counter at two for a quarter of a dollar. Fancy Virginia smoking tobacco, costing from \$1.50 to \$2 per pound, and cigarettes, have increased in price, I will admit. But, Sir, when it comes down to the tobacco that is consumed by a large number of the members of this House, when it comes down to the tobacco that is consumed by the Minister of Inland Revenue (Sir Henri Joly de Lotbiniere), when it comes down to the tobacco which is consumed by the masses of Canada to-day, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) knows full well that the price of that tobacco has been reduced by 50 per cent. Before I take my seat I shall prove to the satisfac-

TRY.

tion of the hon. gentleman that such is the case. I do not want to be misunderstood on this point. I say that tobacco manufactured from foreign leaf is dearer to-day than it was prior to the tariff of 1897.

Mr. CLANCY. Hear, hear.

Mr. COWAN. I am glad the hon. member for Bothwell agrees with me in that, and I hope he will go further and agree with me in my next proposition. While fancy foreign tobacco has increased in price, I say that the duties imposed by this government have brought into existence in Canada a tobacco the equal in every way of tobacco which is manufactured from foreign leaf, and to-day you can buy one pound and a half of that tobacco for the same price that you paid for one pound prior to 1897. I shall prove that assertion to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy), so that when he again makes a speech on tobacco he will not fall into the error he has fallen into to-night. Prior to the tariff of 1897, there were twelve plugs to the pound, costing five cents a plug, or sixty cents a pound. You can now buy Canadian tobacco, either smoking or chewing, equal in quality to that for five cents a plug, eight plugs to the pound, or forty cents a pound. You can to-day buy a pound and a half for the same amount of money that you paid for a pound prior to 1897. That means that the quantity of tobacco that cost five cents prior to 1897 can now be bought for three and a half cents, or one and a half cents per plug or fig, cheaper than before the duties were arranged by the Liberal government. I have no desire to give an object lesson in the House, but if any one denies that statement I will refer him to the standard makes of tobacco. I have in my hand—and I will go into the quality later on—'Consols' smoking tobacco, manufactured by Wm. McDonald, of Montreal, probably the best known man in the tobacco trade in Canada. Here is 'Consols' smoking, weight one-fifth of a pound, worth twenty cents a plug at the retail store—and I am dealing with the retailer now, and not with the wholesale man, because after all, it is with the retailer that the workingman deals. We have here five plugs to the pound, at twenty cents a plug, or \$1 a pound. I have another sample, one of the best known brands of tobacco manufactured from the foreign leaf, 'T. and B.,' made by Tuckett & Billings, of Hamilton. The weight of this is one-quarter of a pound, and some retailers sell it for twenty cents and some for twenty-five cents, so that its cost is from eighty cents to \$1 a pound. I now hold in my hand the product of the Empire Tobacco Company, of Granby, Quebec, a plug made out of tobacco grown in Bothwell, Kent and Essex counties, purchased there and shipped to Granby, Quebec, where it is manufactured. This sells at ten cents a plug, four and a half plugs to the pound, being forty-five cents a pound. Here is McDonald's Consols, \$1 per pound, T. & B., eighty cents to \$1 a pound, and the Empire Tobacco Company's tobacco, forty-five cents per pound, or 50 per cent. cheaper than the foreign article. So much for that line of smoking tobacco. I produce here McDonald's 'Briar,' eight plugs to the pound, retailed in every store at ten cents a plug, and I have here again the Empire Canadian leaf, nine plugs to the pound, worth five cents a plug. One eighty cents a pound, and the other, made by the Empire Company, worth forty-five cents a pound, and yet the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) stands up in his place in this House

and at this
to follow the
member for
one or two
all attention
ling before I
ne solid hour
n mind—that
to 1896. He
to buy were
the startling
t the whole

little length.
from the lips
s statements
he circulates
they take no
ment about
before they
(Mr. Clancy)
e poor man's
ad in assent.
ld have been
e facts. No
se he grows
of Wallace-
buy for 66½
to pay \$1 for
othwell (Mr.
obacco have
ents, or that
ney Virginia
arettes, have
down to the
this House,
Minister of
down to the
hon. gentle-
eco has been
the satisfac-

and states that the poor man is taxed \$1,150,000 a year on his tobacco, and the funny part of it is that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) still needs his head in confirmation of the erroneous assertions he made to the House. I am not through with the hon. gentleman yet. We will now take chewing tobacco. I hold in my hand the 'Prince of Wales,' manufactured by McDonald, sixteen plugs to the pound, at five cents a plug, or eighty cents a pound. I hold here the Empire Tobacco Company's 'Currency,' one-tenth of a pound, costing five cents, or fifty cents per pound. So that, you can buy more than one and one-half pounds for the same price that you pay for a pound of the other. I have here the Empire Tobacco Company's chewing tobacco, ten plugs to the pound, or fifty cents per pound. While McDonald's tobacco costs eighty cents a pound, the Canadian tobacco costs fifty cents a pound, and I ask the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) if the cheaper kind of tobacco I have produced here is not the kind of tobacco—chewing and smoking—that is used by the laboring men and masses of Canada?

Mr. CLANCY. The hon. gentleman asks me a very fair question, and I am going to answer it. He has made a correct statement as to the present; but he should have stated to the House that he is quoting the price of a tobacco that forms less than one-tenth of all the tobacco used in Canada. The hon. gentleman knows that. I stated that there is \$1,050,000 on tobacco over 1896, and I appeal to the Finance Minister whether that is not correct.

Mr. COWAN. As usual, when the hon. member for Bothwell opens his mouth, he puts his foot in it; and I will show the hon. gentleman how deep down it has sunk. The hon. gentleman has made the statement that Canadian tobacco forms less than one-tenth of the tobacco consumed in Canada. Well, fortunately we are able to get at the exact amount of Canadian leaf that has been consumed in Canada, and although it is a little out of the line of the argument I intended to pursue, I am going to deal with this at once. The Canadian tobacco produced in the year ending the 30th of June, 1896, according to the Inland Revenue Returns, was 474,205 pounds; in the year ending June 30th, 1898, it was 1,989,429 pounds; and in the year ending June 30th, 1899, it had increased to 2,575,955 pounds. Taking the last year of the old regulations, ending June 30th, 1896, and comparing that with the year ending June 30th last, there is an increase of 540 per cent., or there is 54 pounds consumed now to what was consumed prior to the tariff changes. I will go further, and figure it more closely for the hon. gentleman. In the year 1894-5, the percentage of Canadian leaf compared with the total product was only 5.8 per cent., whereas in 1898-9 it increased to 26.2 per cent. For the six months ending the 31st December, 1899, it had further increased to 36.2 per cent., and for the month of January last it had increased to 45.2 per cent. And yet the hon. member for Bothwell knows so little of the staple product which he himself produces, and which is produced in his own constituency, that he makes the lamentable exhibition and the erroneous statement that less than one-tenth of the tobacco used in Canada is of Canadian growth. Surely, if we can produce tobacco of as good a quality made from Canadian leaf, and it can be purchased in Canada to-day at less than two-thirds of the price of tobacco made from foreign leaf prior to the tariff of 1897, it does not operate as an additional tax on the masses, but as

an
mor
that
ferti
was
entl
that
and
incr
hon.
mini
had
take
to c
matt
Both
minis
have
Crow
memb
'Whe
the h
give
memb
I am
ten ye
2.153 p
gentle
.024 po
Then,
not fol
a still
by the
sumpti
the reg
and yet
statem
An
and the
no care
class of
into Can
of that
these h
support
Wh
ing clas
he woul

an absolute saving to the people of Canada by giving them 50 per cent. more tobacco than they could formerly obtain for the same money. I think that is a proposition that even the hon. member for Bothwell with his fertile imagination and lack of information will hardly contradict. Now, it was stated by the ex-Controller of Customs (Mr. Wallace), who had apparently as little knowledge of the matter as the hon. member for Bothwell, that there had been a falling off in the consumption of tobacco in Canada, and that the cause of this was that we had raised prices and caused increased smuggling into Canada; and, strange though it may seem, that hon. gentleman holding a responsible position in this House, and an ex-minister of the Crown, carried the matter one step further and said that we had imposed those tobacco duties in order that increased smuggling would take place along the borders of Canada, for the sole purpose of giving jobs to our political friends as preventive officers. Now, I want to take this matter up, and while I do so I want the attention of the hon. member for Bothwell, because there is no man who demands the attention of every minister of the Crown when he speaks so much as that hon. member. I have noted it since I came into the House in 1896. If a minister of the Crown attempts to engage in conversation with his neighbor while the hon. member for Bothwell is speaking, that hon. gentleman stops and says, 'When the minister of so-and-so gets through, I will proceed.' Surely, if the hon. member for Bothwell is entitled to ask ministers of the Crown to give their undivided attention to him when he is speaking, the hon. member, a private member, should at all events give me his attention when I am discussing an article grown in his own constituency. I will go back ten years. On June 30th, 1889, the consumption of tobacco in Canada was 2.153 pounds per head. On June 30th, 1896, a few days after the hon. gentlemen were defeated, it had shrunk to 2.129 pounds per head, or .024 pounds per head less under the regime of the hon. gentlemen opposite. Then, if the statement is correct that greater smuggling went on, would it not follow as a natural sequence that the consumption would have fallen to a still lower point? But I turn to the population of Canada, as figured out by the statistician, Mr. Johnson, and I find that on June 30th, 1899, the consumption of tobacco had risen to 2.174 pounds per head, or an increase under the regime of gentlemen on this side of the House, of .045 pounds per head, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite try to base an argument on the erroneous statement that increased smuggling has gone on in Canada.

An hon. gentleman opposite and the press of hon. gentlemen opposite, and the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Gillies), stated that no cultivation, no care, no expenditure of capital, no skill, no manufacture, would enable a class of tobacco to be grown in Canada, equal to the foreign leaf imported into Canada. But when an hon. gentleman on that side makes a statement of that description, he shelters himself behind the bald, bare statement, as these hon. gentlemen generally do, without one single fact or authority to support it.

When the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), said that the laboring classes of Canada, had been taxed \$1,050,000 on tobacco alone, I thought he would have gone on to show why we did not produce that tobacco in

Canada, or, if we did produce it, why it was not consumed by the Canadian people; but like the rest of these hon. gentlemen, who have taken every opportunity in their power to throw a stone at Canada's tobacco industry, they have not produced a single line of authority to show that Canadian tobacco is not in every way the equal of the foreign article. I am not foolish enough to stand up in this House, for an instant, and say that we can produce Havana fillings for cigars, but neither can they do it in the United States. I am not going to say that we can produce tobacco of the fancy types for cigars, or the finest Virginia leaf, but three-quarters of the tobacco consumed in the United States, and nine-tenths of the tobacco brought into the Dominion from the United States, can be produced to an equal, if not greater state of perfection in Canada than it can be in the United States, and I purpose backing that statement up, not by my own bald assertion, but by the best authorities—not one or two authorities, but half a dozen of the best authorities—that can be got in the tobacco world, not only on the continent of America, but the continent of Europe. Let me give you first a Canadian authority, Mr. D. H. Ferguson, of Montreal, a man of wide experience both in foreign and Canadian leaf tobacco, and, I think, I am quite within the mark, when I say there is no manufacturer in Canada, who has a wider and longer experience, or is more versed in every department of the tobacco business, both as regards the growing of tobacco and its cure and manufacture, in this Dominion. Mr. Ferguson says:

"Taking into consideration the short period that the cultivation of tobacco in Canada (particularly in Western Canada) has been in vogue, the farmers are to be congratulated on their success in producing a tobacco which in point of quality closely approaches their prototypes in the United States. I refer more particularly to the type known as 'Burley' which is now so largely used in the United States and Canada for a sweet chewing tobacco.

"I have seen and purchased this type of leaf in both the counties of Essex and Kent and can state that they approach very closely in merit the best grade grown in Kentucky and Ohio. The color and texture of the domestic article when grown under proper conditions leaves nothing to be desired from a manufacturer's standpoint."

I would like to tell my hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), that I have listened to his voice for two mortal hours, and would ask him to listen to mine, for he is the one gentleman on that side to whom I am talking to-night.

"Due allowance should however be made for the want of experience in handling and curing as compared to the long experience and the high state of cultivation which the farmers in the United States have with years of experience brought to a state of perfection. That our farmers can and do now produce a very fair grade of leaf suitable for chewing tobacco and which will improve as their experience develops goes without saying. We now manufacture in Canada plug chewing made from domestic raw leaf which is of very fair quality and compares favorably with that made from good American leaf."

Mr. Ferguson was speaking only of the crop of 1898, and I have just a word to say with regard to that crop. In 1897, the duties upon tobacco gave such a stimulus to the industry, that every kind and grade of tobacco in Canada was gobbled up at enormous prices. The hon. member for Bothwell knows

the
cer
the
adv
and
adv
and
ever
prol
can
the
grow
resu
and
back
it in
went
ing
given
they
the in
produ
Ohio,
N
Kent
Scotla
In rep
O. Mc
"Y
freely
Burley
of that
on whi
"Y
freely
One of
industr
of Glas
tobacco
come to
brought
buyer fo
been bu
the hon
hon. gen
there w
telegran
To M. K
"In

by the Canadian
have taken every
tobacco industry,
y that Canadian
ticle. I am not
and say that we
ney do it in the
e tobacco of the
quarters of the
of the tobacco
produced to an
t can be in the
not by my own
authorities, but
e tobacco world,
of Europe. Let
of, of Montreal, a
tobacco, and, I
manufacturer in
versed in every
wing of tobacco
son says:

e cultivation of
en in vogue, the
icing a tobacco
s in the United
Burley' which is
sweet chewing
ounties of Essex
merit the best
of the domestic
g to be desired

cy), that I have
him to listen to
n I am talking

of experience in
the high state
with years of
ers can and do
g tobacco and
ut saying. We
mestic raw leaf
that made from

ve just a word
acco gave such
acco in Canada
othwell knows

that the manufacturers were paying actually 12 cents and 14 cents and 15 cents a pound for the second growth of tobacco, that would not be cut in the county of Essex to-day. A gentleman residing in Leamington took advantage of the situation to hold meetings through the counties of Essex and Kent in the winter of 1897, and point out to the farmers the enormous advantage which they could gain by abandoning practically everything else and going largely into tobacco raising. He told them that he would buy every pound they grew, at 10 cents per pound and better; and in that prolific district, where they grow a ton of tobacco to the acre, any person can figure up what an enormous profit that would give. That so stimulated the farmers and others in that locality, that many people went into the growing of the plant, who had not the proper means for curing it, and the result was, that some was hung up on the fences, some under shade trees, and a large amount in stables, etc., until fully 50 per cent. of the crop went back to the manure heap. These people did not have the facilities for curing it in 1898, yet the best of it was culled out, and that was the tobacco that went on the market in 1899; and so bitter was the lesson which the producing classes of that community were taught by virtue of the bad advice given them by this gentleman in the interests of the tobacco combine, that they have profited by that bitter lesson, and last year those who went into the industry, were men capable of caring for the plant, and the crop to day produced in the county of Essex, is as fine as can be found anywhere in Ohio, Illinois, Wisconsin, Pennsylvania, York State or Kentucky.

Now, I come to my next authority, Mr. Thomas Semple, of Sécric, Kentucky, the purchaser for the firm of Alexander McEwan, of Glasgow, Scotland, one of the largest importers of tobacco in the United Kingdom. In reply to a letter sent to him, Mr. Thomas Semple wrote as follows, to W. O. McNutt, Secretary Tobacco Growers' Association of Essex and Kent:

"Mr McDonald, a large manufacturer in Montreal, Canada, buys quietly this same grade of Burley on the Louisville market."

Burley is the variety of tobacco purchased by this Scotch firm, and samples of that variety grown in Essex were forwarded to Mr. Semple, of Kentucky, on which he gave this opinion:

"You should get a purchaser at home in Mr. McDonald, who purchases freely of this same grade of Burley in the Louisville market."

One of the best experts, one who has spent a long time in the tobacco industry, the purchaser for the large importing house of Alexander McEwan, of Glasgow, Scotland, unbound and untrammelled, with no interest in the tobacco markets of Canada, gives the statement I have just read. Then, I come to W. T. Gregory, who is a native of a tobacco district, who was brought up in the leaf tobacco trade, and has been for years expert tobacco buyer for the largest factories in the United States. For two years he has been buying in Essex. When the attack was made on Canadian tobacco by the hon. member for Richmond, N. S., (Mr. Gillies), expecting to follow that hon. gentleman, I telegraphed to Mr. Gregory asking him to wire reply, as there was no time to communicate by mail. I have here Mr. Gregory's telegram in answer:

To M. K. Cowan.

March 10, 1900.

"In reply to your inquiry, would say that the class of Canadian-grown

leaf that enters into the manufacture of tobacco is of the same type and equal in quality to the foreign leaf used by manufacturers in this country."

I subsequently wrote to Mr. Gregory, asking him three questions. First, what his experience had been; second, the names of the firms for whom he had purchased in the United States, and third, their financial standing. I will give you his reply:

"In reply to question No. 1, regarding my experience in tobacco, will state that have been in business thirteen years, and during that time have bought 15,000,000 pounds of tobacco. Bought two years for J. D. Cooper, exporter and speculator; bought four years for Allen & Ginter, one of the largest firms in United States, and was for seven years buyer for the American Tobacco Company."

Any man who knows anything about the tobacco trade of the United States knows that the American Tobacco Company is literally the trust of the tobacco industries of the United States, and that Allen & Ginter are one of the largest, if not the largest, firms in the United States in the production of fancy types and cigarettes:

"I was raised on a tobacco farm, and have seen the tobacco business in all its forms, from the field to manufactured product. The firms named are of national reputation, as you asked me to state size and standing of firms that the writer represented."

In regard to the amount of Burley used—I would ask you to notice this point particularly, and I wish to diverge again to say that nearly nine-tenths of the tobacco consumed in Canada outside of fancy Virginia grades, cigarettes and Havana cigars, is made from the Burley type:

"In reply to question No. 2, in regard to amount of Burley used in manufacture of black chewing tobacco in Canada, will say that the Burley type is used almost exclusively. In regard to 'smoking,' will state that it is not used to the extent as for chewing, but the writer has seen a remarkable, yes, phenomenal, increase in the sale of Burley smoking in the past twelve months. The State of Kentucky (which produces Burley exclusively) is by far the largest tobacco-producing state in America, and a very large majority of all tobaccos are made from the Burley type, Virginia and Carolina tobaccos being used almost exclusively for cigarette and light smoking. Canada is capable of producing a type of tobacco that in flavor, texture and general character will compare most favorably with the Kentucky product. In fact, there is tobacco in the warehouse in Leamington now that is equal in every respect to the foreign leaf. Our growers are just beginning to reach that stage where they can grow it to perfection, having passed the experimental stage."

That is the opinion of one of the best tobacco experts on the continent. But I would like the hon. member for Bothwell to listen to the opinion of Mr. Alex. Harthill, of Louisville, Kentucky, one of the largest, if not the largest, leaf tobacco buyers in the world, and a world-famous authority on all that pertains to leaf tobacco, who paid a special visit to Canada last year for the purpose of investigating our leaf. After a thorough inspection of our crop he returned home, and in an interview with the representatives of the trade press, stated that he had seen tobacco grown by our farmers that was fully equal in quality to that grown in Kentucky.

Now, I hold in my hand the *Western Tobacco Journal*, published in the city of Cincinnati, Ohio. This is a copy of the issue of May 22, 1899, containing

same type and equal
his country."

the questions. First,
firms for whom he
financial standing. I

n tobacco, will state
g that time have
s for J. D. Cooper,
Ginter, one of the
ars buyer for the

the United States
y the trust of the
Ginter are one of
the production of

acco business in all
rms named are of
ding of firms that

o notice this point
rly nine-tenths of
grades, cigarettes

f Burley used in
that the Burley
ll state that it is
en a remarkable,
the past twelve
clusively) is by
ry large majority
Carolina tobaccos
king. Canada is
ture and general
product. In fact,
is equal in every
ng to reach that
he experimental

continent. But
opinion of Mr.
not the largest,
rity on all that
st year for the
on of our crop he
es of the trade
that was fully

shed in the city
890, containing

about nine columns of a description of the Canadian tobacco fields and Canadian tobacco as written by this same Alexander Harthill, of Kentucky. I do not wish to weary the House, but I will read one or two short extracts:

"I saw little of Canadian cigar tobacco. One specimen of Zimmer's Spanish was a beautiful, silky leaf, but very light in color, while another was a desirable brown color, with fine texture. I gave to a friend a cigar made of Canadian cigar leaf of the 1897 crop with Sumatra wrapper, and he pronounced it a good full-bodied smoke."

Now, if the western district is capable of producing a cigar tobacco—and we all know that Zimmer's Spanish is a cigar tobacco of rich brown color—acceptable to an expert like Harthill, and yielding, as his friend declared, a large full bodied smoke, then, the western district of Canada is capable of producing a tobacco equal in quality to that which we at present import from the United States. Now, one word more. Hon. gentlemen opposite, the opponents of Canadian tobacco have a tendency rather to hold up the McDonald tobacco, the Prince of Wales chewing and the pipe tobacco, as manufactured by McDonald, at Montreal, as the standard, and to say that the Canadian tobacco is not equal to that which he manufactures from the foreign leaf, the imported article far excelling the domestic. This Mr. Harthill, speaking of McDonald, says:

"His using Canadian-grown Burley would be no greater change, if as great, as his changing Kentucky chewing fillers some years ago from Green River (a much stronger tobacco) to Burley entirely, which he uses now."

"To Burley entirely which he uses now." If that is to be the standard, it seems to me that all that remains to be proved is that the Dominion of Canada is capable of producing Burley varieties equal to those produced in the United States, because of the Canadian we receive 1½ pounds for the same price we paid for a pound prior to the days of 1897. In the fertile imagination of the hon. member for Bothwell, if you give a man a pound and a half of tobacco for the same price that he paid for a pound before, the member for Bothwell argues that the people of Canada are having taxes wrung from them on that article. Mr. Harthill goes one step further, and in the same article, he says:

"Meantime the new Dominion is on the road to making the great staple one of her important industries, and to grow at home, in future, what she has spent millions for abroad in the past."

This is not the statement of any man interested in Canadian tobacco, this is not the statement of any Canadian manufacturer, this not the statement of any man who would make a single dollar by virtue of the tobacco duties of 1897. There is an authority quite above the interest that radiates from the breeches pocket; it is an authority sent here for the purpose of investigating the tobacco fields of Canada, and he says that we can produce as good a tobacco of the same grades and the same varieties as we are now importing from the United States.

The most convincing and irrefutable evidence that can possibly be cited as to the quality and merits of our Canadian tobacco is found in the columns of the *Canadian Cigar and Tobacco Journal*. This publication is the recognized organ of all branches of the trade, an admitted authority on all matters pertaining to the great tobacco industry, and having the same relationship

to tobacco affairs that the *Iron Age* does to iron, the *Canadian Lumberman* to lumber, or *The Monetary Times* to matters of finance. Looking over its columns for the past three years I find that when the tariff commissions were touring the country, and when the subject of encouraging the Canadian tobacco industry by a revision of the tariff and excise regulations was first mooted, this tobacco journal was most vehement in its denunciation of such a measure. It stated Canada could never grow tobacco suitable for general consumption, and to attempt such an experiment was utterly ridiculous, so firm was it in its conviction on this point that it culminated in its issue of May, 1897, immediately after the budget came down, with the statement that the new tobacco tariff was 'a monument of absurdity.'

We will turn to subsequent issues and see how the wonderful improvement in the quality of leaf now grown and its success with the public has brought about an evolution in the opinions of this undoubted authority. In January, 1899, in a leading editorial, they say :

"Few of our readers have more than a vague understanding of the rapid advancement of Canadian tobacco as an article of consumption. Within the past year Canadian plug and cut is now selling on its intrinsic merits and increasing in demand to such an extent that it is quite within the probabilities that the close of the current year will see it constitute fully one-fourth of the total consumption of Canada."

Now, let me for a moment diverge to show why this paper should be taken as an authority. Recognizing the changes that have taken place, recognizing the capabilities of Canada in the production of tobacco, realizing that former utterances had been wrong, and yet wanting to be well within the mark, when it stated it would constitute 25 per cent., in point of fact it constituted 26 per cent. and a fraction. It says further :

"Canadian tobacco, once under the ban of public prejudice, is now selling on its own merits, and what is more important, is giving excellent satisfaction to the consumers. The result has brought about the development of a hitherto languishing industry, and to such an extent that it now bids fair to eventually change the whole complexion of our trade."

In January, 1900, after another year of experience with both the grower and the consumer, it comes out with an editorial article, saying :

"The stability of the industry, so far as the pipe and chewing tobacco branches are concerned, has now been established beyond all doubt, and with the constantly improving methods of culture and manufacture, there is no doubt that this tobacco is destined to eventually absorb at least 75 per cent. of the total consumption of what is the largest tobacco-consuming and revenue-producing branches of the trade."

Turn now to almost its last issue, March, 1900, less than two months ago, and we find an editorial under the heading of 'The Tobacco Tariff' :

"A rather uncalled for attack on the tobacco tariff was made in the House a few days ago by Mr. Gillies, member for Richmond, N. S., but as his arguments as to the results of the present tariff and his abuse of Canadian Tobacco were plainly founded on a misunderstanding of the results attained, it will hardly have any effect on the situation. Notwithstanding the abuse which this journal, and with it nine-tenths of the trade, heaped on the tobacco tariff when revised by the present administration, in 1897, and the statements then made that it was absurd to presume that Canadian tobacco could ever become a factor in the trade, the situation to-day is such

that we
wisdom
our far
and ch
\$600,000
Americ
just 50 p
under t
into life
product
wisdom
direct b

And th
operate

—on th
changed
masses.
more th
cents pe

Then
Canadian
The ind
friends.

three lo
to-day a
right.'
went int
States of

House ti
future of
never co
to-day tr

hon. mer
order fo
standing

I want to
of protec
the princ
for any i
of this co

concern
cause V
tobacco e
and that
there are
Canadian
manufac
The cigar
to-day th
words, tw

that we are compelled in simple justice and by force of facts, to admit the wisdom of the administration in the measure then adopted. Not only have our farmers grown tobacco quite the equal of that used for plug smoking and chewing by the foreign leaf factories; not only was upwards of \$600,000 left in the hands of Canadian farmers last year that once went to American leaf markets, but the great masses of the people have been given just 50 per cent. more tobacco of equal quality for the same money than under the old tariff. Beyond this, a practically new industry has sprung into life; twenty-five new factories are now turning out Canadian tobacco products, and this influx of capital is ample evidence of the importance and wisdom of the measure. The tax, it is true, did for a time operate as a direct burden—

And therefore the hon. member for Bothwell went to sleep when it did operate as a direct burden.

—on the trade and public, but the evolution of a domestic tobacco has changed this, and it is now a tax on the classes that is handed over to the masses. The million dollars gained from the tax on foreign leaf now little more than offsets the loss of revenue involved in the low tax of only five cents per pound on Canadian tobacco.”

There is the evidence of a high authority of the position in which the Canadian tobacco producer and the Canadian tobacco grower stands to-day. The industry is not in the position that its merits must be sounded by its friends. To-day it comes into the camp of the enemy; and after fighting for three long years in the face of opposition, nine-tenths of the trade comes out to-day and says: ‘We were wrong and the government of Canada were right.’ They are paying the farmers of Canada to-day \$600,000 that formerly went into the breeches’ pockets of the tobacco producing classes of the United States of America. And yet these hon. gentlemen who have stood up in this House time and again, and made the rafters ring in pointing out the glorious future of Canada, in supporting the hothouse and spoon fed industries that never could and never will support themselves, are standing up in Canada to-day trying to blacken the character of a great Canadian industry. The hon. member for Bothwell endeavors to ruin a staple of his own county in order to secure a point against his political opponents. Now, I am not standing here as a protectionist. I have never stood as a protectionist, but I want to tell hon. gentlemen opposite after we have had eighteen long years of protection from them, that, at any time, any man who is an admirer of the principle of protection will point out that the results can be attained for any industry in Canada that have been attained for the tobacco industry of this country, I want it to go on record that so far as that industry is concerned, I am one of the strongest protectionists that could advocate its cause. What are the results? I find that the factories using Canadian tobacco exclusive of cigars for the year ending June 30, 1896, numbered ten and that the factories using foreign tobacco numbered 27. I find that to-day there are twenty-five Canadians and seventeen foreign. The factories using Canadian tobacco in three years increased 250 per cent., while the factories manufacturing foreign tobacco decreased from twenty-seven to seventeen. The cigar factories using Canadian tobacco in 1896 were two in number, to-day they are twelve in number, or an increase of 600 per cent., or, in other words, twenty-five new factories have been started and stimulated by this

government. We who come from the west know well that the clarion-toned and trumpet-tongued member for Bothwell goes up and down the counties of Essex, Kent, Bothwell and Elgin saying: Look at the tall chimneys that the national policy, the protective policy, has stimulated and brought into life. And yet, the hon. member for Bothwell cannot rise in his place and show where the protective policy, in eighteen long years, ever stimulated twenty-five factories in other lines of trades or industry in the four western counties. We can point to twenty-five new factories existing in Canada in the short space of three years in tobacco alone, and to the fact that the greater portion of the benefits resulting from these industries goes to the masses, to the farmers who produce the tobacco, to the laboring men who earn their money by the sweat of their brow in the Canadian tobacco fields and the tobacco factories of Canada, and that the money goes into the pockets of the consumers of the common grades of tobacco. In the face of this the hon. gentleman rises in his place and says that \$1,050,000 was taken out of the poorer people of Canada in taxes. Then, when asked to state why and how, he said "because one-tenth of the tobacco consumed in Canada is made from Canadian leaf," while in point of fact, over 45 per cent. was manufactured from it in January last. The hon. gentleman actually did not know the difference, although he spoke with all the assurance of a man who could leak wisdom on the subject. Earlier in this debate, and earlier in the night I gave the hon. member for Bothwell the figures of the consumption of Canadian tobacco in Canada from 1896 down. I also gave him the percentage that Canadian tobacco bore to the total consumption, and therefore I need not now weary the House by going into that any farther. But I want to tell the hon. gentleman that the Empire Tobacco Company distributed \$300,000 last year in wages to their workmen, that they spent \$150,000 in increasing their plant, to say nothing about the twenty-four other factories. Does any hon. gentleman think that these gentlemen, tobacco experts, would invest such large sums of money in the industries for the manufacture of Canadian tobacco were they not thoroughly satisfied that it was a product that would strike the palate of the Canadian consumer, and that it was equal in texture, aroma, flavor and general character to the foreign article. Now, the crop of 1898 was put on the market in 1899. I have already referred to the fact that the growers lacked the facilities for curing it, but they went to work in 1898 and got the facilities, and the result is that the tobacco crop grown last year is only being purchased now, and will not go to the consumer until next year. When it does go to the consumer it will be found that the crop is 50 per cent. finer than that grown in 1898. As has been stated by Mr. Gregory, these men have come to a point in Canada that it took the United States years and years to reach. Some hon. gentlemen may ask in view of the fact that under the excise regulations which imposed twenty-five cents per pound excise on foreign leaf and five cents per pound excise on Canadian leaf, giving a protection of twenty cents a pound upon the home grown article, or an advantage of twenty cents per pound, under the regime of the hon. gentlemen opposite, how it was that Canadian tobacco only amounted to a little over 5 per cent. of the total consumption. Hon. gentlemen opposite sat on the treasury benches for eighteen long

years,
in this
opposi
grades
consum
grow i
you ma
acres o
none,
Fieldin
will te
Canadi
Turkish
tobacco
that sta
bring t
any wr
of Cana
well (M
the bac
can put
cover u
Clancy)
has a w
in any c
not grow
ment w
tobacco
We hav
can grow
or Kent
wrapper
governm
was, and
ment ha
the hon
asks in t
let him p
plug of C
will dem
thing wh
this cour
governm
blend to
could ha
and this
ing as a
that the

years, they saw the tobacco industry, which, at one time, was an industry in this country, but which, by the absolute stupidity of hon. gentlemen opposite languished from year to year, declined by different steps and grades until it got down simply to an infinitesimal part of the tobacco consumed in Canada. At one time they made a man take out a license to grow it. Then there was practically only one man who could buy it, and you may depend upon it that the buyer was not Grit. Where there were acres of tobacco in Essex and Kent years ago, it got down to practically none, until the business management of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and his colleagues took hold of it, and placed it upon its feet. I will tell you what the explanation is. Prior to 1897 you could not mix Canadian and foreign tobacco in Canada. I could go to Turkey and get the Turkish or Egyptian tobacco; I could go to Cuba and get the Cuban tobacco; I could go to Virginia and buy the lemon wrapper produced in that state; I could go to Kentucky and buy the Burley tobacco, and I could bring them to Canada and mix them and blend them to suit myself and put any wrapper on them I saw fit; but if I were a producer or a manufacturer of Canadian tobacco, the government of which the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) was a bright and shining light—in supporting them, in the back concessions in the western counties—that government said: You can put a lemon Virginia wrapper around Kentucky Burley, but you cannot cover up Canadian Burley with it. Let me tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clancy) that every one of those plugs of smoking tobacco I have produced has a wrapper grown in the State of Virginia, and which cannot be grown in any other State of the American Union. That lemon-colored wrapper is not grown elsewhere. The result of the policy of the Conservative government was, that the Canadian manufacturer producing Canadian Burley tobacco had to put a Burley wrapper around it. What was the result? We have not yet succeeded in growing a decent wrapper in Canada, but we can grow as good a wrapper as they grow in New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania or Kentucky. But, in the United States they do not have to put an Ohio wrapper around Ohio tobacco. The result of the policy of the Conservative government was that we had to put our tobacco on the market just as it was, and its appearance damned it in the sight of every man. This government had business ability enough to grapple with the situation, and when the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy) goes back to his county, and asks in the different school-houses what this Liberal government has done, let him put his hands in his pants pocket, produce his tobacco, and every plug of Canadian Burley he finds there with a Virginia wrapper around it will demonstrate to him something done by this government, and something which has meant thousands and thousands of dollars to the people of this country. In 1897, when these tobacco duties were imposed, this Liberal government passed a regulation that any factory could take out a license to blend tobacco. They could have it all Canadian, if they wanted to; they could have it all foreign tobacco, if they wanted to; or they could mix it, and this government showed its wisdom by going a step further and providing as a safeguard, until such time as the tobacco industry got on its feet, that the manufacturer should not put a lemon wrapper around any tobacco

that did not contain at least 25 per cent. of foreign leaf. The government provided that we could take the Canadian tobacco and experiment with it up to 75 per cent., but the manufacturer could not put a lemon wrapper around any tobacco that did not contain at least 25 per cent. of foreign leaf. That insured that the industry would not be killed in its infancy by unscrupulous manufacturers who might cover up a shoddy article with a bright-colored wrapper. That regulation continued in force in 1897, and part of 1898. In 1898, the Tobacco Growers' Association of the western counties met at the village of Kingsville and passed a resolution asking the government to reduce the amount of foreign tobacco necessary to be used in mixing down to 10 per cent., which practically covers the wrapper only. That resolution was presented to the government and was agreed to. By reason of that one regulation concerning mixed tobacco factories, enabled us to put a tobacco upon the market presentable in appearance, and the inside spoke for itself. I need only point this House once more to the expert opinions on our tobacco, and to the largely increased amount of Canadian tobacco consumed in Canada to prove the success of the Liberal policy in that regard. When the hon. member for Bothwell (Mr. Clancy), and when the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson)—I had nearly forgotten him—stated in this House that this government has increased taxation on the laboring men by reason of the tobacco duties, they are making statements which they have not tried to verify, or else they are making unfounded statements for the purpose of getting party capital and caring not what damage these statements might do to the Canadian growers and the Canadian manufacturers of tobacco. I am advised by the wholesale men that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Henderson) could have gone to Georgetown or Oakville, or Acton, in his own constituency, and at least in four places in any one of these towns and villages, he could have bought the Canadian tobacco for forty cents a pound where he would pay eighty cents for the foreign tobacco now, and sixty cents prior to these duties of 1897.

I have one more point, Mr. Speaker, before closing. The hon. member for Richmond, N.S., asked the other day of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), the hon. member for Antigonish (Mr. McIsaac), the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Fraser), and other members representing the maritime provinces: How could they explain to their constituents the imposition of an extra duty on the tobacco of the fishermen of the lower provinces. Well, these gentlemen can take up these figures which I have just given from the blue-books of parliament, and from the Inland Revenue Returns, or they can hold up the product of the Empire Tobacco Company to prove the wisdom of the policy adopted by this government. I said then as I say now that I am prepared to go to the country on this issue. I did intend speaking of cigars, but I shall not detain the House at this late hour further than to say that cigars retailing at five cents in Canada and manufactured from foreign leaf are made very largely from tobacco grown in Wisconsin State. I would like to see the Canadian representative in this House who would dare to stand on his feet and say that the state of Wisconsin can produce anything that South-western Ontario cannot produce. In speaking of this question in 1895, the hon. member for West York (Mr. Wallace), the hon. member for

Eas
on
smu
boun
no p
whe
with
for s
but t
I pre
prov
facto
mont
was
about
Mr. H
prod
ing t
facto
which
seven
portio
east t
to fill
obtain
but th
reason
there
which
he ha
got th
and h
eviden
Ju
knows
cane-s
further
will be
north-
will be
just as
and or
throug
produc
Califor
States.
cannot
a high

East Elgin (Mr. Ingram), and the hon. member for South Leeds (Mr. Taylor), on different occasions, stated that there was a large amount of tobacco smuggled into the western counties of Ontario along the international boundary line. Where the two countries are separated by water, there is no point at which the communication is so easy and so cheap as at the city where I live, there is no place along the international boundary line where, with three immense railways crossing and with the ferry system, the facilities for smuggling are so great as at Windsor. Yet, that there is no smuggling, but that the people of the county of Essex prefer to use the Essex tobacco, as I prefer to use it, as against that manufactured from the foreign product, is proved by this, that the Leamington Tobacco Company started with a small factory employing twelve or fifteen hands in 1899; yet in less than three months the output of that factory was trebled, and in less than six months it was increased sevenfold, and had increased the number of its employees about fourfold, and enlarged its premises threefold. In conversation with Mr. Fenton, the manager of the works, I asked him why he did not get his product down into the maritime provinces, and he answered: 'Notwithstanding the increase of our output, the number of hands employed and the factory space, we have never yet been able to get outside of the territory in which we first sold our product. Although the product had increased sevenfold, it was consumed in the counties of Essex, Kent, Elgin, and a portion of Middlesex. He told me that he had never been able to get further east than the city of London, because he could not get out sufficient tobacco to fill the orders west of the city of London. If these hon. gentlemen could obtain any evidence of smuggling, they should obtain it in those counties; but there is no tobacco smuggled into the country there for the simple reason that the article grown at home is equal to the foreign article. Now, there are several members of this House who smoke the Empire tobacco, which is purely a Canadian tobacco. I know a tobaccoist who told me that he had a caddie of tobacco made from foreign leaf, but that since he had got the product of the Leamington factory he had sold five caddies of that and had not yet finished the one made of foreign leaf, which is sufficient evidence in itself of the high quality of the Canadian article.

Just one word on climate and soil, and I shall close. Any man who knows anything about tobacco, any man who knows a cigar from a piece of cane-stalk, knows that I am quite within the mark when I say that the further north you can ripen a fruit or bring a plant to maturity, the finer will be its quality and texture and the greater its perfection. So the further north you can grow tobacco and succeed in ripening it perfectly, the finer will be the grade of that particular tobacco. Hon. gentlemen opposite might just as well stand up and say that because we cannot grow figs, bananas and oranges, therefore we cannot grow fruit; yet anybody who has been through the counties of Lincoln, Essex and Kent knows that we can produce in those counties a finer peach than can be grown in Southern California, Georgia, Louisiana, Florida or any other part of the United States. The hon. gentleman might just as well say that because they cannot grow figs and lemons in Nova Scotia, they cannot produce apples of a high grade in the Annapolis Valley. So, because we cannot grow the

Havana filler or the Sumatra wrapper, the hon. gentlemen might just as well say that we cannot grow tobacco at all. The hon. member for Richmond, N. S., (Mr. Gillies) said that the flavors of the black tobaccos of the state of Kentucky were the finest in the world. If the hon. gentleman had taken the trouble, as I did, to look up the meteorological reports of the state of Kentucky and of Western Ontario, he would have found that we have as many sunny days during the tobacco growing season as they have in the state of Kentucky. Some years ago the Ontario government, copying an article written of the south-western district, published it for circulation in the old land, and there are one or two extracts in it which I propose reading :

Pelee Island, only sixteen miles from the main shore, is in latitude 41 degrees, 36 minutes. A line east and west through Pelee Island passes through Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana and California; through northern Portugal and Southern Turkey in Europe. One-third of Spain, three-fourths of Italy, and almost the entire Adriatic Sea lie north of Pelee. Fishing Point is fifty miles nearer the equator than the southern-most verge of France.

Due east of the vineyards of Pelee are the vineyards of Old Castle, of the Apulian Valley, in southern Italy, and the orange grove of Barcelona.

The Island of Pelee, as has been intimated, is famous for its vineyards, and for the wines which these produce. The best variety of grapes can be grown abundantly and of magnificent size. The failure of the grape crop is almost unknown on the island, whereas in Eastern France, famous in Europe for its grapes and wines, there is a failure about once in three years, while in only one year in three does the crop reach perfection. Vineyards of from twenty to thirty acres everywhere dot the island, yielding from four to five tons of fruit to the acre.

Fig and almond trees, with a little winter protection, bear abundantly. Cotton-seed has been ripened. Maize, sugar cane, pea-nuts, sweet potatoes, the pawpaw, white mulberry, peach, apricots, nectarine and quince will flourish and bear abundantly.

And what is true of the climate and products of Pelee Island is, in the main, true of the county of Essex, its nearest neighbor on the mainland.

In conclusion, let me say, that if the hon. member for Bothwell—a constituency which lies not 30 miles further to the north—would stand up in this House and say a word or two in favor of the climate and soil, and the inhabitants that he represents, instead of rising here and endeavoring to propagate, through the medium of the public press, the fallacy that the tariff changes of 1897, have resulted in an increase in the price of tobacco—if he had stated what is the fact, that it had resulted in a decrease in the price, instead of an increase, and that you could purchase one and a half times as much tobacco now, for the same amount of money, that it cost prior to 1897—if, in other words, he had told the plain truth, it would have been better for himself, better for his constituency, better for an industry which stands, by virtue of the tariff changes, without a parallel in the history of Canada as regards its growth—if he had stated that the output had increased by 700 per cent., that the manufacture of cigars had increased 600 per cent., and that of leaf tobacco 250 per cent., while at the same time, the article has been cheapened to the people of Canada between 30 and 50 per cent., he would have performed his duty more faithfully and creditably to his country, his constituency and himself.

might just as
ber for Rich-
baccos of the
ntleman had
ports of the
und that we
as they have
government,
lished it for
n it which I

latitude 41
land passes
gh northern
three-fourths
ee. Fishing
ost verge of

astle, of the
elona.

vineyards,
apes can be
rape crop is
famous in
three years.
Vineyards
g from four

abundantly.
et potatoes,
quince will

d is, in the
ainland.

-a constitu-
up in this
bil, and the
eavoring to
ey that the
tobacco—if
ease in the
and a half
hat it cost
would have
n industry
lled in the
the output
d increased
same time,
30 and 50
creditably